

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/733,752	HAMMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian E Pellegrino	3738	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian E Pellegrino.

(3) Brian Chase.

(2) John Forcier.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10-15 and 19-26.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Brian Pellegrino
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed the limitation of the stent being "releasably coupled to" the connecting segment, but it was noted that claim interpretations were not limited such that something that is indirectly "coupled" to the stent would read on the claims. Mr. Forcier also pointed out the prior art apparatus was placed in a different location in the body, but the Examiner stated that recitations in how apparatus is used does not differentiate against the prior art when the structure limitations have been satisfied. Applicant proposed amending claims to differentiate how the prior art is coupled differently than Applicant's apparatus.

Primary Examiner
Brian Pellegrino